


This is Google's cache of <http://www.hobbypeople.net/rcsource/fags/freqlist.htm>.
Google's cache is the snapshot that we took of the page as we crawled the web.
The page may have changed since that time. Click here for the current page without highlighting.
To link to or bookmark this page, use the following url: <http://www.google.com/search?q=cache:ec8a62021m1j:www.hobbypeople.net/rcsource/fags/freqlist.htm+frequency+band++channel&hl=en&ie=UTF-8>

Google is not affiliated with the authors of this page nor responsible for its content.

These search terms have been highlighted: **frequency band channel**

Radio Control Frequency List

27 MHz Frequency Band

Channel Number	Frequency (MHz)	Flag Color	Usage Restrictions
1	26.995	Brown	none
2	27.045	Red	none
3	27.095	Orange	none
4	27.145	Yellow	none
5	27.195	Green	none
	27.255	Blue	Shared with CB Radios

While there are no legal restrictions to using a 27MHz frequency for model airplanes, it is generally used for cars & boats.

There are no officially recognized channel numbers for 27MHz. The numbers given here may appear on the crystals since this numbering system is used in other countries.

50 MHz Amateur Frequency Band

Channel Number	Frequency (MHz)	Flag Color	Usage Restrictions
00	50.800		

01	50.820	<div> <div>Black Streamer plus Channel Number</div> <div> Amateur Radio Operators have a large choice of Frequencies available for Radio Control Models. The Academy of Model Aeronautics (AMA) sanctions these particular Amateur Radio frequencies for aircraft use in AMA events. This is not a legal restriction, but we do recommend it. For more information on Amateur Radio frequencies, obtain a copy of F.C.C. Rules & Regulations Part 97 from a U.S. Government Printing Office, the American Radio Relay League (ARRL), or your nearest Amateur (ham) Radio store. </div> </div>
02	50.840	
03	50.860	
04	50.880	
05	50.900	
06	50.920	
07	50.940	
08	50.960	
09	50.980	

CAUTION: *Usage of these frequencies requires a valid Amateur Radio License. See F.C.C Rules & Regulations Part 97.*

72 MHz Frequency Band			
Channel Number	Frequency (MHz)	Flag Color	Usage Restrictions
11	72.010	<div> <div>White Streamer plus Channel Number</div> <div> Model Aircraft Only </div> </div>	
12	72.030		
13	72.050		
14	72.070		
15	72.090		
16	72.110		
17	72.130		
18	72.150		
19	72.170		
20	72.190		
21	72.210		
22	72.230		

23	72.250	White Streamer plus Channel Number	Model Aircraft Only
24	72.270		
25	72.290		
26	72.310		
27	72.330		
28	72.350		
29	72.370		
30	72.390		
31	72.410		
32	72.430		
33	72.450	White Streamer plus Channel Number	Model Aircraft Only
34	72.470		
35	72.490		
36	72.510		
37	72.530		
38	72.550		
39	72.570		
40	72.590		
41	72.610		
42	72.630		
43	72.650	White Streamer plus Channel Number	Model Aircraft Only
44	72.670		
45	72.690		
46	72.710		
47	72.730		
48	72.750		

49	72.770	<div> <div>White Streamer plus Channel Number</div> <div>Model Aircraft Only</div> </div>	
50	72.790		
51	72.810		
52	72.830		
53	72.850		
54	72.870		
55	72.890		
56	72.910		
57	72.930		
58	72.950		
59	72.970		
60	72.990		

Usage of these frequencies does not require a special license, but the operator is still liable for knowing the regulations set forth in F.C.C. Rules & Regulations part 95.

75 MHz Frequency Band			
Channel Number	Frequency (MHz)	Flag Color	Usage Restrictions
61	75.410	<div> <div>Red Streamer plus Channel Number</div> <div>Surface Models Only</div> </div>	<div> <div>Not For Use In Model Aircraft!</div> </div>
62	75.430		
63	75.450		
64	75.470		
65	75.490		
66	75.510		
67	75.530		
68	75.550		

69	75.570		
70	75.590		
71	75.610		
72	75.630		
73	75.650		
74	75.670		
75	75.690		
76	75.710		
77	75.730		
78	75.750		
79	75.770		
80	75.790		
81	75.810		
82	75.830		
83	75.850		
84	75.870		
85	75.890		
86	75.910		
87	75.930		
88	75.950		
89	75.970		
90	75.990		

Red Streamer
plus
Channel Number

Surface
Models
Only

Not For
Use In
Model
Aircraft!

Red Streamer
plus
Channel Number

Surface
Models
Only

Not For
Use In
Model
Aircraft!

Usage of these frequencies does not require a special license, but the operator is still liable for knowing the regulations set forth in F.C.C. Rules & Regulations part 95.

NOTE: In order to reduce interference between radios, many racing organizations only sanction even *channel* numbers for R/C Car & Truck racing.

Frequently Asked Questions

http:// 1 39 39 1 /se rch q c che:eC8 ZOZ MIJ:www ho ypeople net/rcsource/f qs/freqlist htm+ frequency+ n / /

This is Google's cache of http://www.pts.org/html/legal_issues/policy/other/comp_bid.htm.
Google's cache is the snapshot that we took of the page as we crawled the web.
The page may have changed since that time. Click here for the current page without highlighting.
To link to or bookmark this page, use the following url: http://www.google.com/search?q=cache:3jReeV5YRzkJ:www.pts.org/html/legal_issues/policy/other/comp_bid.htm+non+reserved+frequency+4hl=en&ie=UTF-8

Google is not affiliated with the authors of this page nor responsible for its content.

These search terms have been highlighted: **non reserved frequency**



THE ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC TELEVISION STATIONS

HOME ABOUT APTS MEMBERSHIP FIND YOUR PTV STATION

FAQ

HOT LINKS

Local Service
National Voice

REGULATORY / LITIGATION ISSUES

Other Issues

Competitive Bidding/Comparative Standards

In response to an FCC rulemaking implementing the mandates of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, APTS advocated that all noncommercial educational (NCE) broadcast, translator, and ITFS applicants be exempt from auctions, regardless of whether they would occupy **reserved** or **non-reserved** spectrum. APTS, NPR, and CPB filed joint comments urging the FCC to use a comparative point system to decide competing applications involving NCE applicants. The FCC decided to use filing windows and a point system to select among mutually exclusive applications for **reserved** NCE channels. However, for channels that are not **reserved** for NCE use, such as television translator channels, the FCC decided to employ auction procedures.

On June 12, 2000, APTS, CPB and NPR appealed the unfavorable auction portion of the FCC's decision to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. On July 3, 2001, the Court agreed with public broadcasters and invalidated the FCC's decision to subject NCE stations to auctions when they apply for **non-reserved** spectrum. The court held that "nothing in the Act authorizes the Commission to hold auctions for licenses issued to NCEs to operate in the unreserved spectrum."

Download:



- D.C. Circuit's Decision Forbidding the FCC from Auctioning Spectrum for which NCE's Have Applied, (94k, pdf)
07/03/01
- FCC's Second Reconsideration Order, (141k, pdf)
07/05/02
- FCC's First Reconsideration Order, (543k, pdf)
02/15/01
- FCC's Comparative Criteria Order, (435k, pdf)
04/04/00
- APTS, NPR and CPB Joint Reply Comment, (151k, pdf)
03/15/99
- APTS, NPR and CPB Joint Comments, (227k, pdf)
01/28/99

This decision was an important victory for public television, particularly for NCE TV translators, all of which operate on **non-reserved** spectrum. The matter was returned to the FCC to develop a system to decide how to award station licenses involving **non-reserved** spectrum, particularly those involving competing noncommercial and commercial applicants. As we did in the original FCC proceeding to implement the statute, APTS worked closely with CPB, NPR and other groups to arrive at a workable and fair consensus policy to present to the FCC.

Shortly before the Court issued its auction ruling, the FCC had slated a number of mutually exclusive low power and translator applications for auction, including 13 CPB-qualified applicants filing a total of 61 applications. On July 27, 2001, APTS petitioned the FCC to stay its auction pending its resolution of the Court remand.

Download:

- APTS Petition for Stay of Auction 81, (56k, pdf)
07/27/01

On February 14, 2002, the FCC issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to seek comment on three proposals to implement the Court's order:

1. barring NCE entities from applying for **non-reserved** channels;
2. permitting NCE entities to acquire licenses for **non-reserved** channels when no commercial entity applies for them; or

3. providing NCE entities opportunities to reserve additional channels.

The FCC also dismissed APTS' petition to stay the above referenced auction as moot as it considered how to implement the Court's order.

In response, APTS filed comments on May 15, 2002, opposing any proposal to bar or otherwise restrict access by NCE entities to nonreserved spectrum. In addition, APTS argued for policies that preserve the use of nonreserved spectrum by NCE translators. In order to preserve existing noncommercial television service, APTS argued that NCE TV translators be given additional first-come, first-serve application processing opportunities on a rolling basis. Such applications would include NCE TV translators that would "fill in" gaps in public television analog or DTV coverage (or gaps due to the transition from analog to DTV service). For NCE translators that seek to extend public television service to currently unserved or underserved areas, APTS argued that the Commission use a need-based system. If the NCE TV translator application were mutually exclusive with other applications, APTS argued that the Commission should require the translator applicant to make a showing as to why the translator **frequency** should be awarded for noncommercial use.

On April 10, 2003, the FCC issued its decision. The FCC chose not to ban public TV stations from applying for **non-reserved** channels but decided that it would dismiss any applications for full power public TV stations on **non-reserved** channels if there were conflicting commercial applications. However, the FCC also affirmed that it will continue to allow applicants for full power public TV stations to petition the FCC to reserve additional TV channels if an already-**reserved** channel is not available and there is a need for public TV service in a given area.

Although the FCC reaffirmed the principle that applicants for full-power public TV operations are exempt from auctions when applying for **non-reserved** frequencies, the FCC determined that low-power public TV translators will be subject to auction if mutually exclusive with other commercial and/or noncommercial applicants, unless the translators are to be operated by a municipality transmitting only NCE programs. The FCC based this decision on a very narrow and, we believe, irrational reading of the statute (47 U.S.C. § 309 (j)(2) and §397(6)) and its own rules that do not include public TV translators in its definition of those entities that are eligible to be licensed by the FCC as noncommercial educational stations. However, if engineering solutions are possible, the FCC will afford translator applicants a prior opportunity for settlement with competing applicants. Because public TV translators are not licensed according to a Table of Allotments but on a drop-in basis, the opportunity to reserve a **frequency** does not apply to these stations.

The FCC also declined to adopt NPR's proposal to reallocate TV channel 6 for noncommercial educational radio use, a proposal that APTS opposed. APTS, with NPR and CPB, is examining appropriate next steps to take.

Download:

- Station Memo from the Legal Department on the FCC's Decision (97.5k, pdf) **password required**
4/14/03
- FCC's Decision on the Use of **Non-Reserved** Spectrum (247k, pdf)
4/10/03
- Supplemental Memorandum of APTS Opposing Subjecting NCE Translators to Auction, (755k, pdf)
12/12/02
- ExParte Letter of 01/08/03, (104k, pdf)
01/08/03
- Reply Comments of APTS, (88k, pdf)
06/17/02
- Comments of APTS, (141k, pdf)
05/15/02
- FCC's Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to Implement the D.C. Circuit's Decision in NPR v. FCC, (172k, pdf)
02/25/02

The point system for resolving conflicts between mutually exclusive NCE applications is also the subject of a separate appeal in federal court brought by various religious broadcasters who claim that the system favors NPR and PBS affiliated stations. APTS has joined NPR as interveners in this case to defend the regulations. This case is pending before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

- Joint Brief Filed by APTS and NPR, (225k, pdf)
04/17/03

[top]

APTS

- HOME
- ABOUT APTS
- MEMBERSHIP
- FIND YOUR PTV STATION
- FAQ
- HOT LINKS

This is Google's cache of <http://www.current.org/in/in008s.html>.
Google's cache is the snapshot that we took of the page as we crawled the web.
The page may have changed since that time. Click here for the current page without highlighting.
To link to or bookmark this page, use the following url: http://www.google.com/search?q=cache:_1pOrs6PFagJ:www.current.org/in/in008s.html+non-reserved+frequency&hl=en&ie=UTF-8

Google is not affiliated with the authors of this page nor responsible for its content.

These search terms have been highlighted: **non reserved frequency**



In fights for noncommercial channels, FCC gives an edge to the locals

Originally published in Current, May 1, 2000

By Mike Janssen

Until recently, it seemed that Simon Frech's squabble with two religious broadcasters over an FM **frequency** would never end. In 1995, the FCC stopped considering competing applications from noncommercial broadcasters for radio and television frequencies, leaving Frech and many others in bureaucratic limbo.

Adding it up

The FCC's new point system for choosing among noncommercial broadcasters vying for the same **frequency** will reward several characteristics:

3 points if the applicant is locally based, which the FCC defines as being physically headquartered, having a campus, or having three-fourths of its board members within 25 miles of the community;

"It's frustrating," says Frech, g.m. of KNUD in Garberville, Calif., who was about to launch a campaign to persuade the religious broadcasters to back off. Now Frech can scuttle that tactic. The FCC announced April 14 [2000] that it will adopt a point system to settle disputes involving noncommercial broadcasters. Pubcasters have generally asked for some kind of point system, but many are unhappy that — in the cases where commercial and noncommercial applicants vie for **non-reserved** channels — the FCC will settle the matter with high-stakes auctions.

The FCC used to settle disagreements with hearings, but shelved the process in 1995 after a federal court declared it "arbitrary and capricious, and therefore unlawful." Applications have piled up ever since — by one estimate, 2,000 requests could await action at FCC headquarters. The vast majority are from radio broadcasters, and

religious broadcasters filed most of those.

2 points if the applicant owns no other local broadcast stations. An applicant that can't claim this credit but is part of a statewide network providing service to accredited schools can also claim 2 points;

1-2 points to an applicant whose **frequency** covers significantly more area and population than the next best proposal.

Among other criteria, the FCC will favor broadcasters that are locally based and own no other stations (see box). If two applicants have an equal number of points, the one with the fewest stations will get the **frequency**. If that doesn't settle it, the FCC will favor the applicant with the fewest pending applications, and any remaining ties will be settled with time-sharing requirements in the case of full-service stations.

In cases where two or more noncommercial applicants go for the same **non-reserved frequency**, the FCC will give preference to those who promise to extend service to the larger number of people

unserved by a noncommercial station.

Now that the FCC has adopted new standards, all previous applicants will have to amend their filings to make their case for points. Newcomers will have to wait to enjoy the benefits of the new system; the FCC has put a temporary freeze on applications for new noncommercial stations, and might not lift it for a year or more.

"We're very happy to finally have something out," says Carol Pierson, president of the National Federation of Community Broadcasters. "We hope that the FCC will go through the backlog as quickly as possible, because there are applicants that have been frozen out of providing local broadcasting to communities for years."

Pierson and others are not happy about one aspect of the new rules. Due to the FCC's interpretation of federal law, pubcasters will have to take part in auctions against commercial broadcasters if both are vying for a **non-reserved** channel. NFCB and APTS fear that commercial broadcasters will have an unfair advantage in the wallet.

The prospect is especially menacing to public television, where the impending transition to DTV threatens to dislocate a number of translators. Stations forced to relocate their Channel 60-69 translators to lower channels could lose out, says Lonna Thompson, director of legal affairs for APTS. Thompson cites a recent auction in which bidding opened at \$80,000, and moved upward at \$20,000 increments. "Those are real-world dollars our stations don't have," she says.

FCC commissioners also disagreed over auctions. In a dissenting statement, Harold Furchtgott-Roth and Gloria Tristani argued that the section of the Communications Act at issue exempts noncommercial broadcasters from entering auctions, regardless of the **frequency** at stake. NPR and APTS agree. "We think the statutory language is clear," Thompson says. "Congress intended all of our stations to be exempt from auction."

In a separate dissenting statement, Tristani also argued that stations should get extra points for broadcasting locally originated programming. NFCB also supported credits for local programming and shares Tristani's disappointment. Local programming has been an inherent part of broadcasting since the beginning, says Cheryl Leanza, an attorney with the Media Access Project who

represented NFCB.

At this point, broadcasters unhappy with the auction requirement or any other part of the system can request reconsideration or judicial review once the FCC's decision appears in the *Federal Register*. NFCB is considering taking action, and NPR is consulting with member stations on the matter.

In the meantime, the new standards could start to shrink the FCC's backlog of applications if previous applicants realize they don't stand a chance. "There's less incentive just to hang out there and delay if you're clearly going to lose," says communications attorney John Crigler. If an applicant has no chance of winning the points for localism, he says, "it might make sense to recoup expenses and get out of the way."

Another lawyer worries that the new standards could interfere with the rollout of low-power FM, the much-debated plan that critics charge will also disrupt the transition to digital radio. Now that the point system is a go, applications for translators might pick up, says attorney Michael Couzens, and more translators could mean less space for low-power stations. If high demand for low-power stations drags out LPFM filings, low-power operators "could be looking at rural Missoula at best," he says. "And urban areas would be even more precluded than they are today. ... If the Commission needs more staff [for handling LPFM], they should reassign and process them."



[To Current's home page](#)



[Earlier news: The FCC proposes lotteries to choose among noncommercial applicants in 1998; podcasters speak up for a point system.](#)



[Related document: Text of FCC's April 2000 order.](#)

Web page posted May 8, 2000

Current

The biweekly newspaper that covers public broadcasting

A service of Current Publishing Committee, Washington, D.C.

[E-mail to webmaster](#)

(202) 463-7055

Copyright 2000